

## The Review and Herald.

"Sanctify them through Thy Truth: Thy Word is Truth."

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., MARCH 5, 1889.

URIAH SMITH, - - - - - EDITOR.  
L. A. SMITH, - - - - - ASSISTANT EDITOR.  
G. I. BUTLER, S. N. HASKELL, G. C. TENNEY,  
EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS.

### ANOTHER ATTACK.

#### Seventh-day Adventism "Exposed" Again.

MOSES, notwithstanding all his "mistakes," still survives; and Seventh-day Adventism, despite its many "exposures," never enjoyed a wider influence than it wields to-day.

It is the fortune of every cause which is designed to lead men to clearer light, greater knowledge, and better morals, to find itself antagonized from almost every quarter. The Devil does not take kindly to these regenerating influences. And if our cause was any exception to the rule, it might well cause serious misgivings as to its nature.

Bitter and unprincipled opposition is therefore not to be classed with the unexpected; the surprise pertains rather to those who engage in the work, and arises when we see men who might be supposed to possess sufficient refinement of organization to lead them to have some regard for dignity of deportment, and their own self-respect, descend in pursuance of their object, into the arena of personal vituperation.

A few days since, we received from one of our ministers in Wisconsin, a copy of a tract of 26 pages entitled, "Seventh-day Adventism: Some of its Errors and Delusions. By Rev. A. McLearn." The tract toddles along in the usual runway of opposers of S. D. Adventists. It is a reduplication of the old tirades of the past forty years; a rehash of false charges and misrepresentations which have become so stale as to be past use without the aid of the smelling-bottle.

While so unprovoked an attack is a matter of some surprise in itself, there is a feature connected with it which is more to be regretted still; for the tract bears the imprint of the "American Sabbath Tract Society," the Seventh-day Baptist publishing-house, at Alfred Center, N. Y., being issued and sold by them; and is furnished with an introduction by one of their ministers, "Rev. J. B. Clarke," who has never, so far as we are aware, had any special association with the S. D. Adventist people, and who has consequently no occasion to lend his assistance to this work, other than his denominational connection. This virtually commits the S. D. Baptist denomination to this method of opposition and this form of attack. We have ever felt that we had occasion to respect and honor that people for their long defense of the sacred institution of the Sabbath; and we had hoped that they would never be betrayed into a course of action which would tend to embarrass such an attitude on our part. But if they are unable to avoid feelings of alienation and bitterness, of course they have a right to choose that way of expressing them which they may deem most creditable to themselves.

A bad break appears at the very outset between Mr. M. and his second. Thus Mr. C., in his "Introduction," speaking of the work of S. D. Adventists, says:—

The sad examples on the one hand, of apostasy from all religious faith, and on the other of bigoted adherence to teachings that seem to make those who practice them censorious, unloving, and bitter toward all opponents, have been among the fruits that have come to our notice.

These, it seems, are all the fruits which Mr. C. has been able to discover. He finds just two classes of S. D. Adventists: one abandoning all religious faith; the other becoming censorious, unloving, and bitter. But when, on the next page, Mr. M. comes to enter upon his work, these are his opening words:—

In writing upon this subject, it should be distinctly understood that it is with no invidious spirit or disposi-

tion to injure any one. The Seventh-day Adventists, as a body, have been very kind to me; and there are many of them for whom I have the profoundest respect for their amiability and pure lives.

These are very different fruits—"kind" "amiable" and "pure in life." Either the one who writes this is deceived in regard to this people, or the other does not know them; and if he writes about them without knowing them, it is a shame unto him. Prov. 18:13.

Were it not that the matter is of a serious nature, the picture set before us in this tract would be very amusing; for it is exceedingly ludicrous (or would be if it were not contemptible) to see a man, while slyly pawing around in the mire to work up a mud-ball for the objects of his dislike, call upon all to witness that he has not any wrong spirit, and does not intend to injure any one, and exclaim, "What kind emotions I have! How loving I do feel!" and then when his missile is ready, rise up and hurl it with a venom which shows that he would gladly smirch the whole body beyond remedy, if possible.

We have fallen into the habit, when we meet with works of this kind, of inquiring first of all into the reasons which have called them forth. What great evils does Mr. M. discover, that have led him to be to the pains of writing a tract? We have looked through the twenty-six pages carefully, and are somewhat puzzled to explain the matter. He accuses us of holding certain unscriptural views, and being dishonest in the way we promulgate them. He finds fault with us for believing that in the death of Christ as the basis of the atonement, we have something more than merely the death of a human body; he charges us with being gross materialists because we deny that man is naturally immortal out of Christ; that in our books we dissemble our real views (which is certainly singular, since the books are written expressly to explain them); that we believe that "the door of mercy was shut in 1844;" that we follow Mrs. White as an inspired, infallible prophetess; and that when a person gives up S. D. Adventism, he gives up all religious faith. These are about the sum of our offending, as far as we are able to make it out.

To give up all faith is, of course, to give up the hope of eternal life; and this he sets forth as the general, if not the inevitable, issue out of S. D. Adventism. Yet he has written a book to have everybody give it up! At the same time he admits that a person may be an Adventist and yet be a Christian (p. 15). Now it would seem to us a much better way to let a man remain, yes, earnestly encourage him to remain, in a position in which he may be a Christian and be saved, rather than to try to crowd him into one in which he would almost inevitably be lost.

Speaking of those who give up, he says (p. 14): "Having nothing to fall back upon, and detecting the errors of Adventist theories, they turn away and discard Christianity altogether." But why is it, we ask, that they have "nothing to fall back upon"? Cannot the other churches furnish them anything to fall back upon? If not, are we to blame for it? This is an unconscious acknowledgment that these persons consider Adventism the best there is; and that, if anything could hold them, that could. And this we say is the case. And this is why we have thousands in our ranks whom other churches failed entirely to move, but who now, rescued from infidelity or worldiness, are rejoicing in the blessed hope of the appearing of the Saviour, and of a glorious immortality through Christ their Lord. But there are some whom no religious influences seem sufficient to reach; or who, if they do commence the Christian life, cannot be kept in the way for any great length of time. Many turned away even from the Lord himself when he was here upon the earth. And when such cases occur now, we respectfully submit that Adventism is no more responsible for it than any other denomination; for if there was any other theory in which they could have more confidence, they would turn to that.

Following the last quotation, he says: "This class of apostates is astonishingly numerous." But he has failed to tell us who these are, and in what part of the country they are to be found. We have not yet heard of them. And if it is so, then S. D. Adventism must be making converts at a pretty rapid rate; for each year, for several years past, has shown an increase, over all deaths and apostasies, of many hundred members.

He continues: "Adventists in Battle Creek have said to me repeatedly that if they give up the 'visions,' they give up all." Then we would say, By all means hold on to the visions; for as they counsel to no evil, they cannot hurt you; and it will be better to believe them and cling to your hope, than to "give up all;" for that would be certain death. But Mr. M., knowing these circumstances, says, Give them up; and he writes a tract to help them along. Rather than have us believe in Mrs. White and the mortality of man out of Christ, he would have us give these up, even though we should all go to the Devil. This, then, he must consider the lesser of two evils; and this is one reason that has led us to inquire for the great evils that have called forth his attack upon us.

Mr. M. would of course be glad to see Seventh-day Adventism stop right here and now; and, per consequence, he would be glad if it never had been known. That is what the presence of his tract means, if it means anything more than a little petty spite against a few Adventist leaders. But Mr. M. is a Sabbath-keeper, professing still to love, and rejoice in, the new-found light concerning the Sabbath of the Lord. And who brought him this light and truth?—*Seventh-day Adventists*. And as the result of their work, there are in the land to-day 30,000 Sabbath-keepers, who in all probability would not have been occupying this position, had it not been for this work. But notwithstanding his professed love for the Sabbath, all this seems to count for nothing with him, in comparison with the horrible delusion that man has immortality alone through Christ, and that there is manifested through Mrs. White one of the gifts of the Spirit, which the apostle in Corinthians and Ephesians expressly declares were set in the Christian church. Better that there should be 30,000 less Sabbath-keepers in the world than there are to-day, than that any one should believe in Mrs. White! And so we become more and more puzzled over the secret of his onslaught upon this cause.

But perhaps we have the explanation in this: On page 15 he says:—

We do not claim that an Adventist cannot be a Christian, for there are, without doubt, many sincere but deluded Christians among them; but we do claim that, from the nature of their creed, a person may be a faithful, loyal, and consistent Seventh-day Adventist, and still be unregenerated, and therefore not a Christian.

Oh! Because Seventh-day Adventism is such a system that it is possible for a man to profess it and not be a Christian, therefore let us tear it down. But we wonder if no one ever professed the S. D. Baptist faith who was unregenerated and not a Christian; or the Methodist faith; or Presbyterian, or any other. But you say, in such case, the person was not a "loyal and consistent" S. D. Baptist, Methodist, etc. And, we reply, neither is any unregenerated person a "loyal and consistent" S. D. Adventist, no matter what his profession; for our "creed" is "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus;" and if a person lives up to these principles, he is certainly a Christian.

But perhaps we find the secret of his effort in the closing paragraph, which reads:—

We only hope, for the sake of all who have not acquainted themselves with the nature of this unscriptural system, and for the honor of the Redeemer's cause, that our dear brethren and sisters in Christ, especially of our Seventh-day Baptist churches, will pause and consider well the facts set forth in these pages, before they tamper with this subtle and soul-deceiving delusion.

So it appears that some Seventh-day Baptists may be getting interested, and it is to prevent their embracing these views, that the tract is written. Yet he has failed to show that the delusion is so very

deadly, since a person holding it may be a "Christian," "very kind," and entitled to "profoundest respect," for "amiability," and "purity of life." And he will find that it will not particularly help his cause nor injure ours, when those whom he addresses find that his charges are based on misrepresentation and perversion. An examination of his specific points we must leave to another week.

#### DIFFICULTIES OF MISSIONARY WORK IN EUROPE.

THE idea extensively prevails that there is some law, especially in Germany, that forbids preachers and others from saying anything against the Catholic Church or its doctrines. But that is a mistake. The law is far more general in its nature, but it amounts to that in its operation, because all laws are so administered as to favor the Catholics more than any others. The law forbids the publication or preaching of *anything* that is calculated to cause disturbance, or to create undue excitement. But this is about the way it operates. The Catholics say and publish whatever they please; and if anybody complains, the complainers are prosecuted for raising disturbance. If the Protestants speak against the Catholics, they are prosecuted as the authors of disturbance. In whatever way it comes, the Catholics are privileged, and the Protestants are the disturbers of the peace. Since the conviction of Pastor Thümmel, the Evangelical Alliance have made a collection of bitter things spoken against Luther and the Reformation, by the Catholics, such things as the Protestants would not dare to utter against the Catholics. But it is of no avail; since Bismarck's understanding with the pope, since he has received a decoration of honor from "His Holiness," it is of no use to endeavor to turn the tide. Evangelical papers have declared confidently that no person can obtain or keep in office in Prussia unless they keep in favor with the Catholic authorities. The pope openly instructs his subordinates how to work for the interest of the church in political circles.

Thus it will be seen that any book may be prohibited, against which anybody enters a complaint, no matter what is the subject. But these censorship generally have but a local influence, and may not extend far, or have a large effect. In Stuttgart the little tract written by Eld. White, entitled, "The Judgment," was prohibited. This shows that any of our publications are liable to be prohibited at any place, if complaints are made.

This influence against our publications may increase as prejudice increases against our work. In that case it would be utterly useless to try to prune down our works so as to remove ground of complaint. Or, in the providence of God, which is our trust, feelings may change for a time, so that our works may be circulated. If opposition increases, it may create a demand for these books and tracts, as has been the case in other places, and thus the way be opened by the enemies of the truth.

How it will turn we cannot foresee; but what shall we do? Shall we withhold the truth because of this opposition? We understand the necessity of prudence, and the duty of avoiding giving offense where it may be avoided. But the third angel's message has to be given in these countries, and the warning is against the worship of the beast, as well as his image. Indeed, the worship of the beast is the burden of this message; the offense of the two-horned beast is that he enforces the worship of the first beast. At present the influence and popularity of the first beast is greatly increasing in Europe, except perhaps at its home, in Italy. There the king rules with a firm hand, and will not permit the pope to put forth his pretenses to the right to rule over the kings of the earth.

There are two things which cause us to hope that for a season we may be permitted to work without hindrance. There is no doubt that Bismarck is not as popular as he was some years ago. He has an iron will, and thoroughly believes in the

doctrine of what has been termed the "divine right of kings." He is very nearly an absolutist in principle. And the young Emperor William is not as favorable to the pope as is the chancellor. His visit with King Humbert, of Italy, was very cordial, and he prevented the pope's introducing the subject of his civil rule, in his interview with him. Of course we cannot expect that help from such a source can be anything but partial and temporary; for what William may gain by an open course, he is sure to lose by the intrigues and wiles of the pope's emissaries in the empire. Leo XIII. is one of the shrewdest men in Europe, and is fully determined to exalt the papal see to its old-time honor. Of this object he will never lose sight for a moment. And the favor shown the Catholic Church all over the world, at the present time, gives the Jesuits abundant opportunity to perfect their plans and to insure their success.

But whatever may be the prospect, whatever may be the opposition, we expect the message will be given to the nations of Europe. Silently the truth will operate, and copies of our works will be called for in unexpected times and ways, and the people will learn of the truth. Our duty seems clear, to prepare the truth as it must be given, and trust that Providence may open the way for its circulation. It will be utterly impossible to prepare our publications so that they will not give offense to those who have a hatred to our work. And if we could, they would cease to be effective to warn the world against the worship of the beast and his image. Surely the people of God need wisdom and grace for the present and coming time. But we need not to be discouraged, for in this work we must walk by faith and not by sight; and if we judge by sight, we can know but little of the influence the truth is having in the world. J. H. W.

#### OBSOLETE SCRIPTURES.

ANYTHING is said to be obsolete when it has gone into disuse. This term seems to apply with much propriety to certain duties recommended by the apostle Paul, as, for instance, physical labor for ministers. Paul's authority is considered first-class in all religious duties by the ministry generally. Yet though he gives the plainest instruction upon this subject, it is almost wholly neglected. We quote a few texts: "For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us; for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you. Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread." 2 Thess. 3:7-12.

The apostle presents in these words some important principles relating to Christian duty, for he adds, in close connection, that those who would not heed his commands concerning work and disorderly conduct, should be practically censured or disfellowshipped. The other members were to "note that man and have no company with him," that he might be "ashamed;" yet they were to "admonish" him, and try to save him. These principles concerning physical labor should characterize *orderly* Christian conduct. To neglect them would be "disorderly" walk, and St. Paul was determined that his example should be in all respects a worthy one to follow.

That he had in view physical labor—*working with his hands*—when he says that he "wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you," is evident from other texts. "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know,

that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that are with me. I have showed you all things, how that *so laboring* ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." Acts 20:33-35. "After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth; and found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla. . . . And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them, and wrought: (for by their occupation they were tent-makers)." Acts 18:1-3. "Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and labor, working with our hands," etc. 1 Cor. 4:11, 12. In that most pathetic description of Paul's interest and care for his Thessalonian brethren, this subject is also beautifully presented. "Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ. But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children: so being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us. For ye remember, brethren, our labor and travail: for laboring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God." 1 Thess. 2:6-9.

The "labor" of the apostle, then, that he might not be chargeable to the Thessalonian brethren, was physical labor. One reason why he performed it, was that he might do the more to show them how much he loved them, by the sacrifices he was making for them. He had the "power;" that is, the right, or authority, as a minister of Christ, to call on them for support. If he ministered to them in spiritual things, he was entitled to look to them to supply his necessary wants. He expresses this clearly in 1 Cor. 9:11-14: "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

Here the apostle emphatically indorses the principle that the faithful laborer who ministers the word to the spiritual benefit of the people has a just claim upon them for the temporal blessings which his wants require; and we would not in any sense abate an iota of this obligation resting upon the laity to support the faithful ministry. Yet nothing is plainer in these quotations than the fact that Paul, from the abundance of the love of his soul, and for certain important reasons, chose not to use this "power" which he possessed in common with other ministers, yea, more fully than any other, to look for such support. The noble desire possessed his soul to do all he possibly could for the salvation of others. As the Son of man came "not to be ministered unto but to minister" to others, so Paul, his most devoted disciple, wished to show, all through his life, that it was "more blessed to give than to receive."

He was not satisfied to preach the gospel in the same way that some of those who served the altar did anciently,—labor a given amount, and in that manner receive a support therefrom,—earning a living by a stated amount of work. O no! he made his life all radiant with a higher principle,—to do all he could for others, receiving little in this world in return. He ministered not only in word and doctrine, but by his hands, to the support of those dependent upon him. His life in this respect was such that all could see that he "coveted no man's silver or gold or apparel." He gave his

## The Review and Herald.

"Sanctify them through Thy Truth: Thy Word is Truth."

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., MARCH 12, 1889.

URIAH SMITH, - - - - - EDITOR.  
L. A. SMITH, - - - - - ASSISTANT EDITOR.  
G. I. BUTLER, S. N. HASKELL, G. C. TENNEY,  
EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS.

### ANOTHER ATTACK.

#### Second Paper.

We spoke last week on some of the general principles involved in the little tract by A. McLearn, entitled, "Seventh-day Adventism: Some of its Errors and Delusions." The notice of the work would not be complete, unless some answer was made to a few, at least, of its specific misrepresentations and perversions. The "Rev. J. B. Clarke," who writes a page and four lines of introduction, closes that introduction with these words:—

May all who read these words earnestly seek the Holy Spirit as the guide into all truth, and "obey God rather than men," and trust in Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life," rather than in any so-called prophetess.

This language conveys the impression, as it was doubtless designed to do, that the whole body of Seventh-day Adventists, over twenty-five thousand in number, have taken a "so-called prophetess," meaning Mrs. White, as "the way, the truth, and the life," instead of Jesus Christ. But Mr. C. knows that the views of S. D. Adventists in reference to the relation of Jesus Christ and his work to the law of God, and his position as the only Saviour of men, are precisely like his own. He knows that no people exalt, or can exalt, Jesus Christ and his saving grace, more highly than this people. Why, then, does he represent that we discard Christ and take in his stead a "so-called prophetess"? To those who know the facts in the case, such a charge will prove its own antidote; and it would hardly seem possible that a stranger would give it any credit. But it makes us ashamed of human nature to read such groundless and bare-faced perversions.

Mr. M. accuses us of dissembling in the case of the death of Christ. He says:—

Now, in this case the teachers of Adventism dissemble. They are sharp enough to see that a dogma so palpably erroneous as the *absolute mortality* of Christ would be met by popular derision; hence they resort to the use of phrases calculated to conceal their real meaning, and give the impression that they stand with orthodox Christians on this subject. They claim that Christ is now divine. In some way he became so after his resurrection, but in what manner or by what process they do not pretend to tell.—p. 9.

The false impression conveyed by this language cannot perhaps be made more plainly to appear, than by comparing it with a simple statement of the views we hold and have ever held on this point. We have no peculiar phrases to resort to, but let the Scriptures tell us what we are to believe. They teach us that the divine Son of God had glory with the Father before the world was (John 17:15); that this being took upon him "the seed of Abraham" (Heb. 2:16); that is, became a "partaker of flesh and blood" (verse 14), was "manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16), "was made flesh and dwelt among us" (John 1:14), and was thus "made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death." Heb. 2:9. And this being was just as much the divine Son of God, while here in our estate, as he was before. And as such he died. He laid down his life. And to guard against every quibble, it is said that he poured out his "soul" unto death (Isa. 53:12), and when he was raised from the dead, it is said that his "soul" was not left in hell [*hades*, the grave], neither his flesh did see corruption." Acts 2:31. Mr. M. may believe, if he chooses, that the Son of God did not die; that only the body ceased to live, but the real being continued right on; and that, consequently, we have only the sacrifice of a human body to depend upon; but we prefer to take the Bible as it reads, and believe that Christ gave himself for our sins, and that we therefore have a divine sacrifice as the basis of

our hope. If we are asked to explain how the divine Son of God could pass through these changes, we simply answer in the words of the apostle, "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh." And we do not pretend to be able either to comprehend or explain it.

Again, we are misrepresented in regard to a change of heart. He says:—

They speak of the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men, etc., just as other people do, but when you come to question them about a change of heart, you will be astonished to find that with them the new birth is a thing impossible in the present life. The new birth with an Adventist means the first resurrection. This is made necessary by the dogma that man has no spirit to regenerate.

Mr. M. was, or *professed* to be, once a Seventh-day Adventist himself in good standing. When he undertakes to tell what S. D. Adventists believe, he is therefore stating, of course, what he believed while he was one. But did he ever believe any such stuff as this? If so, had S. D. Adventists known it, they would have been tempted promptly to disfellowship him. But if he could be an S. D. Adventist and not hold such views, they are no inseparable part of S. D. Adventist belief. We believe, as much as any people, in a change of heart by the operation of the Holy Spirit. This is conversion. This change is represented as being "born again" (John 3:3), because it leads to a new and spiritual life. Any change that introduces a new life may be compared to a birth. This is why the resurrection is also called a new birth (Luke 20:36) because, just as our natural birth introduces us to this state of life, and the change of heart by the Holy Spirit, gives us a new spiritual life, so that introduces us to a new state of being, in which we have literal eternal life in the kingdom of God. We do not believe that "the breath of life," sometimes called "spirit," is a mere "puff of air." Man might force air into the lungs of a dead body, and it would accomplish nothing; but God imparts the principle of life; and he made the air breathed into Adam's nostrils the medium through which it was conferred upon him; and hence we have as one of the definitions of the Hebrew *ruahh*, and Greek *pneuma*, "the principle of life, residing in the breath, breathed by God into man's nostrils." But this is not a separate entity, capable of a conscious existence before it is put into the body, and after it leaves it. God did not thrust an immortal being through Adam's nose, into his lifeless body.

Another argument by which Mr. M. tries to prove the continued conscious existence of a disembodied spirit after death, is Rom. 8:10. Thus he says:—

The word of God declares that man has a spirit, and that that spirit is quickened or made alive by the Spirit of the Lord, while the body remains dead. Rom. 8:10. But Seventh-day Adventists teach that man's spirit is simply air, and therefore there is nothing to be quickened. Here is a palpable contradiction between the teaching of Adventism and the Bible.—p. 14.

The text referred to reads: "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness." It is sufficient to remark that this text applies wholly to the present state. If Christ be in you here, the body, the old man of sin, the carnal nature, is dead, but the spirit, the new nature given by Christ, lives and makes us "new creatures" in him. It has no reference whatever to the future state and disembodied spirits.

Mr. M. says that our treatment of other denominations "is neither honest, fair, nor Christian," because we are willing to co-operate with them in any good work, and at the same time hold that they are "Babylon." All there is to this Babylon matter is this: We call no one Babylon. The Bible uses that term in a prophecy which we can apply nowhere else but to the divided and confused Christendom, especially Protestant Christendom, of today. And it is not a term of reproach; for prophecy never indulges in such; but a term used to describe a state or condition which every one knows to exist; for the word means "mixture, confusion;" and no one can believe that it was ever contemplated that there should be so many creeds and

sects in the professed church of Christ. But in these bodies the great mass of true Christians are yet to be found. And not until their divisions are healed, can the term which the prophecy, on this account, applies to them, be avoided.

We come now to the central point of the whole effort; namely, the failures and inconsistencies of Mrs. White. And foremost among these we find the hackneyed charge of the shut door and no salvation for sinners since 1844. As a specimen of Mr. M.'s ability to handle this subject, and his accuracy as to historical facts, we present the following:—

That they believe this, the following facts will show: "Wm. Miller taught, and all Adventists of his time believed and taught, that as Jesus left the outer sanctuary in 1844, the door of mercy was shut forever against the ungodly world." They considered that the work of the Aaronic priesthood exactly represented the work of Christ. For they teach that there is a tabernacle in heaven, the exact counterpart of the one that Moses built, etc.

The facts in the case are that Wm. Miller never knew anything about the view of the sanctuary held by S. D. Adventists, and never indorsed such a view. He based no ideas which he had in regard to the close of the work for the world, on the change of administration in the heavenly sanctuary. After the passing of the time in 1844, Adventists could not, for a time, have done anything for the world, if they had wished to ever so much; for nobody would listen to them. And it would be very natural for them to think that the work for the world was ended, as they were looking for the Lord daily and hourly. But it was this very subject of the sanctuary, which Mr. M. represents as responsible for the shut-door view, which corrected it. That light led out the people known as S. D. Adventists, and the more fully it was developed, the more clearly it was seen that still another message was to be given to the world, and other souls to be reached by it. These are the facts. Compare them again with the statements quoted above.

But Mr. M. argues that our view of the sanctuary, involving the position that we have been in the antitypical work of atonement, since 1844, holds us to the view that Christ then left the mediatorial seat, as no one could bring an offering on the day of atonement in the type.

The trouble with this objection is that there is no truth in it. The penitent *could* receive pardon on the day of atonement. The high priest went into the most holy place with the blood of an offering for the *whole people*, and was a mediator for the people till all the sins were figuratively blotted out. And even if a man had not brought an offering before in the year, he could come to the sanctuary on the day of atonement, afflict his soul, and thus secure an interest in the offering which the high priest was ministering in the most holy place. So in the antitype, Christ is mediator for all who will receive him till his entire work as priest is done. We had hoped to finish our remarks on this subject with this number. But this article is already sufficiently lengthy, and we defer the remaining points till a future time.

### SOCIAL ANARCHY.

ONE of the most ominous signs of the times which American people are called to note is that our country is apparently fast approaching a condition of political and social anarchy in which the authority of the law will be inadequate to the proper protection of society. In those developments which relate to crime and its punishment, this tendency is plainly indicated. There is a growing disregard for the majesty of the law, a growing disinclination to allow the law to take its natural course in dealing with real or supposed offenders. Mob law, into which ignorance, prejudice, and malice enter as the controlling elements, is resorted to instead. In the widely-known and rapidly-extending organization of "White Caps," this kind of law is regularly put in practice against individuals who, by deeds really or apparently evil, have incurred the



## The Review and Herald.

"Sanctify them through Thy Truth: Thy Word is Truth."

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., MARCH 19, 1889.

URIAH SMITH, - - - - - EDITOR.  
L. A. SMITH, - - - - - ASSISTANT EDITOR.  
G. I. BUTLER, S. N. HASKELL, G. C. TENNEY,  
EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS.

### ANOTHER ATTACK.

#### Third and Concluding Paper.

WE were obliged to close last week's remarks with a bare allusion to the charge that our position on the subject of the sanctuary obliges us to take the view that there can have been no forgiveness of sin since 1844, when, as we hold, Christ entered into the most holy of the heavenly sanctuary, and commenced the work of the atonement. The reason upon which they base this charge, is that on the day of atonement in the type, no offering was made for the people, and hence only those who had previously presented their offerings could share in the atonement; and therefore in the antitype, no forgiveness of sin can be secured after the work of the atonement begins.

This view is one which our opponents manufacture for us, upon premises of their own, not upon ours. Their premises we deny, and their conclusion we consequently repudiate. Did they ever stop to think what conclusions would inevitably follow from their premises? If, as they say, all that was done on the day of atonement had respect only to what was done *previous* to that day, then it follows that if a sin was committed on that day, for that sin there was no forgiveness. For if there could be no offering for present sin on that day, which was the tenth day of the seventh month, all opportunities ceased at the close of the ninth day; and when the work of the next year opened, on the eleventh day of the month, the offerings had respect to the sins of that day and onward, and did not *lap back* onto the tenth day, the day of atonement. Hence we say again, according to this view, Whatever sins were committed on the day of atonement could find no forgiveness—the door was shut. Thus our opponents, by the view they hold, will have it that there was, for *one day in every year*, a "shut door" to Israel, for *nearly fifteen hundred years*, while the typical dispensation lasted. This is the worst "shut door" view we ever heard of. Let not such theologians taunt S. D. Adventists with any shut-door doctrine.

We claim that there was an offering for sin on the day of atonement; that is, that the offering ministered by the high priest on that day was a general one for *all* the people; and that if a man, though he had brought no offering before, would come up and *comply with the directions for that day*, he could avail himself of the benefits of that offering. Just so in the antitype. And we repeat that the subject of the sanctuary was the very subject which was calculated to correct the ideas of Adventists on the question of the shut door immediately after the passing of the time in 1844, and which did correct it with all who would receive it. Let the argument above stated, with respect to sin on the day of atonement, be carefully noted.

The much-mooted passage, "The time of their salvation is passed," as appears in "Early Writings," is again brought up. What is the subject of the vision?—This: "The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth." This would imply that there might be reformations from error to truth; but these were not the ones brought to view in the vision. We wonder how much confidence Mr. M. would have in a "reformation," so-called, which was "not from error to truth, but from bad to worse." Whether or not this has yet been fulfilled is an open question. But whether past, present, or future, the subject of the vision is false so-called reformations of the last days, and the ones whose salvation is

spoken of as past, are those who are engaged in those false reformations. The whole scope, intent, and context of the passage demand this construction. But men become so delirious with prejudice that they will hang and quibble upon mere words, rather than be governed by the sense of the narrative. Of this construction the objector says: "He goes back five paragraphs to find the antecedent of the pronoun 'their.'" Very well, look at 2 Sam. 24:1: "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah." Now in this passage, what is the antecedent of the pronoun "he"? The skeptic says the word "Lord" just before. But Mr. M., with every accepted commentator, and every Bible believer, will say, "Satan;" and to find this antecedent we must go back, not merely five paragraphs, but more than five chapters, even into an entirely independent and different book—1 Chron. 21:1. In view of this principle, why quibble over five paragraphs? Why not be consistent, and take as the antecedent of "their" the plainly-expressed *subject* of the vision; namely, those who are carrying on false so-called reformations?

Mr. M. then tries to make out that we apply the language to all ministers, whereas we do nothing of the kind, but apply it only to a particular class.

As another specimen of the way in which Mr. M. treats the writings of Mrs. White, take the following: He quotes from her these words (p. 11): "I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas." The reader will notice that she says "ideas;" but Mr. M., commenting upon this a few lines farther on, says: "And yet Mrs. White claims, and her followers profess to believe, that every line and *every word* is inspired of God." Can any one tell what right he had to slyly change the language, and say "word," when she had only said "idea"? Does not any one know that an *idea* may be expressed in a hundred different ways, and that *words* need not be inspired to set forth a heaven-sent idea? By such foul and deceptive means they try to make the writings of Mrs. White odious.

On this point Mr. M. rests principally upon verbal instead of printed evidence. He says:—

Again, Seventh-day Adventists claim that the writings of Mrs. E. G. White are "equal to the word of God in all respects." Yea; more than this, that when a preference is to be made, the former must take the precedence, "since they are more *recent* and *pertinent* to the *present time*." The italics are our own. I here quote the *verbatim* language of two of their leading ministers, proclaimed from the sacred desk in the Tabernacle, in Battle Creek, Mich., in 1882.—p. 10.

Did Mr. M. ever find anything like this in any of our printed and standard works?—Not a syllable. Whether he ever heard it or not, we will leave the reader to decide for himself. We can only say that we never did. We say that people sometimes look through colored glasses; we might also say that they hear through a telephone, the other end of which is manipulated by the father of lies. But suppose he did hear this; suppose two persons could be found so ultra and unbalanced as to give utterance to such extreme views; is he to judge the whole body by them? Again we say that we never heard any such statements, and certainly nothing of the kind can be found in any of our printed works.

Again he says: "In a meeting held in their Tabernacle in Battle Creek, I heard the testimonies of sixty-two persons. Out of that number only two made mention of the name of Christ." As these were testimonies that he "heard," he of course was not one of the two who mentioned Christ. He then himself failed to do what he now reproaches the others for not doing. This is thrown out to carry the impression that we make nothing of Christ. But what has such an incident, supposing it is true, to do with determining the position and practice of a whole denomination of Christians?—Nothing whatever.

He continues: "The testimony of the sixty was

substantially as follows: "I thank the Lord for the visions; I believe every word of them; I believe that they are equal to the word of God in all respects; and I hope you will pray for me that I may be able to square my life by them." It is astonishing what a faculty this man seems to have had for getting into peculiar meetings, and hearing peculiar testimonies. In all our connection with this people, we do not remember to have heard any such testimony, and we boldly aver that he never heard half a dozen, much less sixty, of the kind.

He further affirms that Mrs. White claims for her writings that they are "equal to and in some respects above the word of God."—p. 12. Such a charge is infamous. In all her writings he cannot find a syllable asserting that they are in any respect above the word of God, or even drawing any comparison between them.

His charge that the visions are made a test of fellowship; that credentials are taken away, and members cut off from the church for not accepting them, is one of the old stale falsehoods referred to in the first of these articles. Turbulent and unruly spirits are to be set aside for the divisions they cause. Rom. 16:17; 2 Thess. 3:6; etc. S. D. Adventists could fellowship a person even if he believed that the dead were conscious, and the soul immortal, if he held those views quietly, and on all matters of conduct kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. But if he made this subject an occasion of strife and wrangling, they would withdraw from him as a disturber of the peace and a causer of division. And so they would do on the subject of the visions, or any other subject. It is a very convenient way, when a person has taken a course to cause a separation from a church, to charge that separation upon some, to him, obnoxious doctrine, especially if he imagines he can thereby raise some prejudice, or inflict some injury upon the people of his dislike. This will explain the position of every one who claims to have been disfellowshipped for not believing the visions.

But we will not pursue this subject any farther. Enough has been presented to show the dishonorable nature of this attack, and the spirit by which it has been prompted. We find in it no evidence that the writer was seeking to heed the injunction of the apostle: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just . . . think on these things;" and we discover in it nothing to lead to a higher and better life. It may for a time influence some, but will stand exposed in its true light to all who will take the pains to investigate the matter fully.

### SPIRITUALISM NOT RETROGRADING.

At the present time and for several years past, the great Spiritualist movement which began nearly half a century ago has taken on a somewhat quiescent appearance, which might lead many to suppose that the period of its rapid progress was ended. That this is actually true, however, is contradicted in a recent issue of the Baltimore *Sunday Herald*, which devotes a column and a half to a review of the rise and progress of Spiritualism in Baltimore, and its present outlook in other parts of the United States. Two or three extracts from the statements there made will show what the situation really is, if the statements of the writer are correct. He says:—

Spiritualism is but little spoken of at the present time, as compared with other matters,—much less thought of,—but it is reasonably sure to attract much public attention in the near future. There is even now a growing sentiment in its favor among individuals who, while not, perhaps, believers in its tenets, are yet unprepared to express total disbelief in or antagonism to it. That consideration of the phenomena it presents is daily becoming more wide-spread there cannot be the least doubt; and it is no less certain, though not so easy of demonstration, that the number of those whose faith is of the "positive kind," is rapidly increasing. It is claimed that there are now 10,000,000 Spiritualists in this country; and while this is probably too liberal an estimate of those who confess their faith openly, it is in all likelihood not excessive, if those who fear or are ashamed to let their convictions